

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,082	12/31/2001	Farhad Zarinetchi	102619-185	1777
21125 7	21125 7590 06/22/2004 EXAMINER			
NUTTER MO	CCLENNEN & FISH	SCHAETZLE, KENNEDY		
WORLD TRA	DE CENTER WEST			
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604			3762	

DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/039,082	ZARINETCHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on      This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This      Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	- action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims		•			
4)  Claim(s) 31-60 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 31-40,44-53 and 57-60 is/are rejected 7)  Claim(s) 41-43 and 54-56 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2001 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration.  relection requirement.  re: a) □ accepted or b) ☒ objected or b) ☐	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12-31-01.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/039,082 Page 2

Art Unit: 3762

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

- 1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: 818 (see pages 10 and 11). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the embodiment wherein the control circuitry is located in the connector (claim 34, etc.) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of

Application/Control Number: 10/039,082 Page 3

Art Unit: 3762

any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## **Specification**

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the status of the applications mentioned on pages 1 and 11 of the specification must be updated.

Appropriate correction is required.

# Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 31-40, 44-53 and 57-60 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 13-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,389,318. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the present claims are merely broader versions of the patented claims. Once the applicant has received a patent for a species or more specific embodiment, he is not entitled to a patent for the generic or broader invention (see *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Claim 13 of the patent, for example, contains all of the recited limitations found in claim 31 of the present application in addition to a recitation of a magnetic shield.

Regarding claim 35, those of ordinary skill in the art would have seen it obvious to cover the opposed side of the primary coil with the magnetic shield in order to allow

Art Unit: 3762

for inductive coupling to occur. A shield on the patient contacting side would hinder such coupling.

Regarding claims directed to the size and shape of the shield, those of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to make the shield larger than the coil to aid in directing the field in its entirety towards the secondary coil, rather than allowing portions of the field to emanate away from the intended target coil. As for the shape, using a shield with the same shape as the coil would have been obvious because such an arrangement allows for a better fit –both mechanically and electromagnetically.

Regarding claims directed to specific dimensional relationships, it would be inherent that any shield with sidewalls of thickness t that cups the coil to have a diameter of at least the diameter of the coil residing within, plus twice the thickness of the shield wall.

Regarding method claims 57-60, the examiner does not consider the method claims separable from the apparatus claims (i.e., the apparatus may not be used to practice another and materially different process and vice versa).

#### Information Disclosure Statement

6. The documents relating to transcripts listed on page 4 of the IDS received December 31, 2001 could not be considered because the examiner has no way of obtaining this information as copies of the documents are absent the parent case filewrappers and no scans of the documents are available to the examiner in IFW.

# Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 41-43 and 54-56 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 41, the prior art fails to disclose the recited magnetic shield thickness in an apparatus comprising the recited connector arrangement in combination with the primary coil and drive circuitry that can be operationally coupled and decoupled as cited. A related comment applies to claims 42, 54 and 55.

Art Unit: 3762

Concerning claim 43, the prior art of record fails to disclose a magnetic shield with a plurality of ventilation perforations formed therein in combination with the primary coil and drive circuitry that can be operationally coupled and decoupled as cited. Similar comments apply to claim 56.

#### **Conclusion**

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kennedy Schaetzle whose telephone number is 703 308-2211. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 -6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703 308-0851. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KJS June 17, 2004

PRIMARY EXAMINED